



1 2000, Appellant provided his specific exceptions. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this  
2 proceeding.

3 Appellant is a program engineer assigned to the Linear Trails Program. Appellant is responsible for  
4 overseeing and coordinating trail projects statewide. He directs the work of subordinate project  
5 staff and he coordinates projects with three regional field offices. Appellant reports to Joe Ward  
6 who is the Engineering Services Manager, a Washington Management Service (WMS) position.  
7

8 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant argues that his position meets the level, scope and  
9 breadth of duties described in the CE 5 classification. Appellant further argues that Parks no longer  
10 utilizes the Chief Engineer classification so reference to that position in the CE 5 definition is  
11 outdated. Appellant contends that he reports to a WMS position that is not assigned a WMS  
12 principal assistant. Appellant asserts that he serves as a division program engineer, that he develops  
13 and implements capital grant programs and that he supervises assigned project staff. Appellant  
14 contends that he is responsible for a statewide engineering function and that his position is best  
15 described by the CE 5 classification.

16 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent argues that the Engineering Services Manager  
17 position is not assigned a principal assistant; therefore, Appellant's position does not meet this  
18 portion of the CE 5 definition. Respondent further argues that Appellant supports the Linear Trail  
19 Program, but he does not establish the direction of the program. Rather, Respondent contends that  
20 the long range planning for the program is a team effort. Respondent further contends that  
21 Appellant does not direct a statewide program, does not control program resources, and does not  
22 supervise permanent employees.  
23

24 **Primary Issue.** Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position should be allocated  
25 to the Civil Engineer 3 classification should be affirmed.  
26

1 **Relevant Classifications.** Civil Engineer 3, class code 60540; Civil Engineer 4, class code 60560,  
2 and Civil Engineer 5, class code 60570.

3 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best  
4 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a  
5 measurement of the volume of work performed nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that  
6 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in  
7 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular  
8 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the  
9 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.  
10 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).  
11

12 The CE 3 classification encompasses positions that are in charge of a unit of professional engineers  
13 or that act as specialists. Appellant performs specialized civil engineering work. However, the  
14 scope of Appellant's position goes beyond this classification. Appellant is responsible for the  
15 engineering section of a statewide program rather than a unit performing engineering work.

16 The definition of CE 5 classification states: "[s]erves as the principal assistant to the Chief  
17 Engineer in an Engineering Division or directs a statewide field engineering function." Mr. Ward is  
18 the Engineering Services Manager, which is equivalent to a Chief Engineer. Appellant is not Mr.  
19 Ward's principal assistant. Furthermore, Appellant does not direct a statewide field engineering  
20 function. Rather, Appellant is responsible for a program with statewide significance. In addition,  
21 Appellant does not direct the program. Rather, he serves on the team that establishes program  
22 direction.  
23

24 The definition of the CE 4 classification states: "[d]irects and supervises major civil engineering  
25 section in the engineering division." Appellant directs the design and coordinates the planning and  
26 construction of projects with statewide significance. He oversees the work of project engineers.

1 Appellant does not supervise permanent employees pursuant to the merit system rules. However,  
2 the CE 4 classification does not require supervision of permanent staff. Rather, the class requires  
3 supervision of engineering projects and project staff, which Appellant does. Appellant's position  
4 meets the scope and breadth of duties and responsibilities intended to be encompassed by the CE 4  
5 classification.

6 **Conclusion.** Appellant's appeal on exceptions should be granted, in part, and his position should be  
7 reallocated to the CE 4 classification. The determination of the Director, dated November 8, 2000,  
8 should be reversed.

9  
10 **ORDER**

11 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal of Steven Wright is granted, in  
12 part, the determination of the Director, dated November 8, 2000, is reversed, and Appellant's  
13 position is reallocated to the Civil Engineer 4 classification.

14 DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2001.

15  
16 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

17  
18 \_\_\_\_\_  
Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

19  
20 \_\_\_\_\_  
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice, Chair

21  
22 \_\_\_\_\_  
Leana D. Lamb, Member